

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,633	12/12/2001	Richard John Booth	5822-PI-0I-CA	9641
James Proscia			EXAM	INER
Warner-Lamber 2800 Plymouth Ann Arbor, MI	Road	MORRIS, PATRICIA L		ATRICIA L
Allii Attot, Mi	46103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
			DATE MAILED: 01/22/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/021,633 Booth et cl
Office Action Summary	Examiner Group Art Unit
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	rs on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address
Period for Reply	*
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET 1 OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	O EXPIRE ON MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relation - If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default	1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. In expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication at the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•
☐ This action is FINAL.	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance excep accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193	t for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in 35 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
Claim(s) 1-44	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
□ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
□ Claim(s):	is/are rejected.
□ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
	are subject to restriction or election
^	
Application Papers	requirement.
Application Papers ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawir	
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on 	ng Review, PTO-948. is □ approved □ disapproved.
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are object 	ng Review, PTO-948. is □ approved □ disapproved.
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ng Review, PTO-948. is □ approved □ disapproved.
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ng Review, PTO-948. is □ approved □ disapproved.
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ng Review, PTO-948. is □ approved □ disapproved. cted to by the Examiner.
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ng Review, PTO-948 is approved disapproved. cted to by the Examiner. nder 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawir □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ng Review, PTO-948 is approved disapproved. cted to by the Examiner. Inder 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). The priority documents have been
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawir □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ng Review, PTO-948 is approved disapproved. cted to by the Examiner. Inder 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). Ithe priority documents have been
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawir □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ng Review, PTO-948. is approved disapproved. cted to by the Examiner. Inder 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). Ithe priority documents have been Iter) ernational Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
 □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawir □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ng Review, PTO-948. is approved disapproved. cted to by the Examiner. Inder 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). Ithe priority documents have been Iter) ernational Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawir □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on □ The drawing(s) filed on □ is/are object □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority u □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numb □ received in this national stage application from the Int *Certified copies not received:	ng Review, PTO-948 is approved disapproved. cted to by the Examiner. Inder 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). Ithe priority documents have been Iter) ernational Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).
□ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawir □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ng Review, PTO-948 is approved disapproved. cted to by the Examiner. Inder 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). Ithe priority documents have been Iter) ernational Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

A Maring Again and in the contract

Part of Paper No.

Application/Control Number: 10/021,633 Page 2

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-20, drawn to compounds and compositions, classified in classes 544, 546548, 549 and 564, various subclasses.
- II. Claims 21-44, drawn to multiple uses, classified in class 514, various subclasses.The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

These distinct inventions have acquired separate status in the art, will support separate patents, and will require different fields of search for the respective inventions. Accordingly, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is considered proper; 35 U.S.C. 121; 37 CFR 1.141; 37 CFR 1.142.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the products as claimed can be used in materially different processes as evidenced by applicant's own claims and specification.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In the event of an election of either Groups I or II, applicants are required to elect a <u>single</u> disclosed species representative of the claimed invention since the variations in R¹, R² and R³ encompass such a broad scope of compounds classified in classes 544, 546, 548, 549 and 564, various subclasses. The diverse members of said R groups include several heterocyclic systems, hetero-aromatic liked fused bicyclic members, aromatic rings mononuclear as well as bicyclic, partially hydrogenated members of both heterocyclic and carbocyclis as well as substituted derivatives of both categories. The burden on the PTO would be enormous.

Should applicant(s) traverse on the ground that the species inventions identified are not patentably distinct, applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the above identified species inventions to be obvious variants, or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, of traverse, if the examiner finds one of the inventions in the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of the other invention.

"A Markush-type claim is directed to "independent and distinct inventions", if two or more of its members are so unrelated and diverse that a prior art reference anticipating the claim with respect to one of the members would not render the claim obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 with respect to the other member(s)". In re Weber, 198 USPQ 330, footnote 3.

A reference to a pyridine here would not be a reference to a thiophene. When one writes out the entire compound, as a whole, one arrives at patentably distinct heterocyclic compounds, along the lines indicated in the Groups of the first page of this action. Distinct, independent, heterocyclic nuclei.

In the event of an election of Group II, applicants are required to elect <u>one method of using</u>, ie., a specific disease.

In, <u>In re Weber</u>, 198 USPQ 332, <u>In re Hengehold</u>, 169 USPQ 473, was noted for the proposition that as long as applicants have maintained the right (as they do here) to file the non-elected subject matter in divisional applications, then restriction is proper, as to that point.

Applicant may file the divisional subject matter noted in divisional applications. If applicant wishes a generic expression of the elected invention the claims here need be amended to reflect that election.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

Art Unit: 1625

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ms. Morris whose telephone number is (703) 308-4533. The examiner can normally be reached Mondays through Fridays.

plm

January 17, 2003